1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda. (Video Time Stamp 00:00:00—00:00:22)

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 P.M.

The agenda was approved.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Robin Angotti. [Exhibit A] (00:00:23—00:01:11)

Angotti invited members to review the remarks in the Exhibit as well as those in her prepared video.

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions. (00:01:12—00:01:44)
   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]

There were no questions.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce. (00:01:45—00:21:56)

President Cauce began by noting that this is one of the oddest years the UW has faced, and she said the work done by the faculty side of shared governance is more important than ever.

Cauce said that this will be a year of struggles and challenges. COVID has personal impact and significantly affects everything the University does. For example, looking at the long-term budget is complicated by possible COVID implications for state revenues. COVID has highlighted pre-existing societal inequities, but this also offers an opportunity to use this awareness to make more progress in this area. In this regard, Cauce noted that the Provost will be unveiling new DEI initiatives this quarter. The upcoming elections and new directives from the federal government also create uncertainty. Moreover, health officials warn of a COVID uptick this fall and winter. Cauce invited members to view her blog for further comments.

Cauce said that the recent Greek outbreak is under control. The Greek system is cooperating with University and health officials, and it is itself instituting sanctions against offenders. The problem does not seem to be related to outsiders, and it must be remembered that communal living presents challenges per se.

Cauce said that there is good news. Large-scale budget cuts in state appropriations are not on the horizon, and the state deficit projections have improved. University enrollment has not been significantly affected by COVID. It is a similar story for local community colleges. UW class evaluations from last quarter were quite good, and students feel that they are having a productive educational experience. Cauce said that even with this good news the UW can’t become complacent.

Cauce said that efforts are ongoing to reimagine campus safety and make sure that the police response, armed or otherwise, is appropriate to the situation. Cauce invited members to attend the forthcoming townhall for more details.

In response to questions, Cauce made several additional points. Cauce noted that both Chancellors (UW Tacoma and UW Bothell) are stepping down. There will be a townhall at Tacoma, and the President and Provost are willing to speak at Bothell, as well. Cauce said that both campuses have made great strides forward under the two Chancellors, and the campuses’ quality has been recognized in independent studies. Bothell and Tacoma are critical in making sure that the UW provides the resources necessary to
support anticipated growth in the Puget Sound area. Each Chancellor felt that it was time to hand off their successes to the next generation of leaders. These retirements are just one part of a large number of senior-level retirements expected over the next few years at the UW and at other academic institutions across the country. Cauce expects a strong pool of applicants for the Chancellor positions, and the UW will take the time to find the right people. Faculty input will be a large part of the hiring process. Cauce said that Provost Richards is working on some changes to help ensure that Academic Personnel is responsive to questions and concerns. With respect to visa issues, some things are simply outside of UW control, but Cauce said that she and the Provost, if contacted directly, will make sure that somebody responds to visa issues.

5. Memorial Resolution. (00:21:57—00:23:51)

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice Chair of the Senate, presented the resolution.

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Professor Emeritus Walter Andrews of Arts & Sciences who died on May 31, 2020, after having served the University since 1968.

Professor Emeritus Robert Albrecht of Engineering who died on June 6, 2020, after having served the University since 1961.

Professor Emeritus Constantine Christofides of Arts & Sciences who died on June 24, 2020, after having served the university since 1965.

Professor Barbara Warnick of Arts & Sciences who died on June 26, 2020, after having served the university since 1980.

Professor Betsy Ancker-Johnson of Engineering who died on July 2, 2020, after having served the university since 1961.

Professor David Schmitt of Arts & Sciences who died on July 3, 2020, after having served the university since 1968.

Professor Emeritus Lillian McDermott of Arts & Sciences who died on July 8, 2020, after having served the university since 1967.

Professor Emeritus Charles Bergquist of Arts & Sciences who died on July 30, 2020, after having served the university since 1989.

The resolution was approved by a moment of silence.

6. Consent Agenda. (00:23:52—00:24:09)
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]

The consent agenda was approved.

7. Announcements. (00:24:10—00:24:49)

Angotti wished Joe Janes, Past Senate Chair and Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, a happy birthday.

8. New Business. (00:24:50—01:28:05)
   a. Class A Legislation – Improving transparency in the promotion and tenure process – first consideration.
On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice Chair of the Senate, moved that the legislation be approved for submission to the faculty.

Margo Bergman, Chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, spoke to the motion, summarizing the information presented in the Exhibit.

During discussion, questions were asked about the meaning of the word “publish.” Bergman explained that despite possible narrow interpretations that could be assigned without context, the intended meaning in this context is that guidelines be visible to everybody, presumably on a website or equivalent. Jack Lee, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, added that elaborations on the intended meaning can be made in other ways such as through guidance from the Provost’s Office.

There was no further discussion.

Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion to refer was approved.

   Action: Approve for submission to the faculty.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice Chair of the Senate, moved that the legislation be approved for submission to the faculty.

Jack Lee, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, spoke to the motion, summarizing the information presented in the Exhibit.

During discussion, several points were made. Lee said that the question of who appoints subcommittees is not answered in the Code. Units can develop their own procedures and the practice in most units is that they are appointed by Chairs(Deans). Lee said that senate legislation is not retroactive. Lee said that the Code does not direct that committees for teaching-track faculty have a teaching-track faculty member. Lee went on to say that the Code does allow for faculty to challenge promotion outcomes based on procedural flaws. Lee explained that the line-11 phrase “academic rank and title” was included to reflect the current voting hierarchy which depends on both the three possible ranks (assistant, associate, full) and titles (e.g. teaching, research, clinical). Concern was raised that married couples in small departments could block promotions. Concern was raised that the legislation be made clear that the promotion vote be restricted to a yes or no recommendation, as opposed, for example, to a recommendation to postpone. It was noted that such a restriction would not eliminate the possibility of postponement as there are already mechanisms in place for that. Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, said that there have been cases where postponement was a voting option, opinions differed on whether that was allowed under the Code as currently written, and a clarification would be beneficial.

A motion was made and seconded to amend line 48 to read “they shall vote whether to recommend promotion.”

During discussion of the amendment, concern was raised that the language did not clearly eliminate options other than an up or down vote. Townsend said that it might be difficult to come up with unarguably precise language and that the discussion here, together with the fact that a change in language was made, would make the intent of the Senate clear that the vote be an up or down vote on promotion and not include other options such as postponement. He added his own view that it was important that the Dean have the faculty’s advice on whether
the criteria had been met per se.

There was no further discussion on the amendment.

The amendment was approved.

Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation as amended be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion to refer was approved.

Action: Approve for submission to the faculty.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice Chair of the Senate, moved that the legislation be approved for submission to the faculty.

Tom Halverson, Chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, Lynn Dietrich, Member of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, and Mel Wensel, Co-Director of Integrated Social Sciences, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material presented in the Exhibit and in a slide deck herein attached as Addendum I.

During discussion, several points were made. Halverson explained that fee-based programs are those not supported by state funds, but by fees designated by the program and charged to participating students. Wensel said that although there may be some in-residence programs that currently are maxed out, the number of students being talked about is small, and, in any case, many would be looking for online courses now existing or to be created. Halverson said that the legislation does not affect restrictions on courses, such as priority enrollment or upper-class standing requirements; rather, the legislation merely says that the fee-based students can get in line like everybody else.

There was no further discussion.

The motion passed.


Patricia Kramer, Department of Anthropology, Seattle, thanked members for good wishes sent with respect to a department faculty member who has gone missing on Mount Rainier.

Laws reminded members of the forthcoming open townhall on caregiving to be hosted by the Faculty Council on Women in Academia. Angotti added that other faculty councils will be hosting townhalls this year.

There was concern that across-the-board budget cuts could have very different effects at the unit level, and it was hoped that alternative approaches could be examined. Janes said that the budget is discussed at the general, as opposed to unit, level with the Provost and Office of Planning and Budgeting at the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), but that disproportionate impacts of cuts in units could be a part of that general discussion. Angotti said that faculty can contact SCPB members about concerns, and Laws added that Senate agenda includes an opportunity to ask the SCPB Chair about their meetings. Angotti then observed that the Faculty Legislative Representatives are available for questions and feedback as well. Jacob Vigdor, Faculty Legislative Representative, said that interested faculty members should look at discussions on stimulus bills in DC and revenue bills in Olympia.

10. Adjournment. (01:43:32—01:43:37)
The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Robin Angotti, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, October 29 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Robin Angotti, Professor, UW Bothell

The Faculty Senate Chair's remarks will be video recorded and put on our website before the meeting.

Dear Colleagues,

As I write this, my mind goes back to winter quarter 2019 when I ran for this position. The world seems like it has turned upside down since that time. I think most of us would agree that 2020-2021 is a year like no other at the University of Washington.

Profound challenges are before us in the upcoming year. Faced with an ongoing global pandemic, instruction has pivoted to primarily online and, for most of us, our living space and work space have melded together. This has presented us the challenge of figuring out how to deliver quality education in an online environment while simultaneously balancing caregiving duties. It has also presented challenges for scholarship by creating a bifurcation in levels of scholarly productivity. For some, the pandemic has been a boon for their particular focus while others, whose work may involve travel or human subjects, have seen research trajectories come to a standstill. Casting a pall over all, in addition to haze from historic wildfires, is the uncertainty surrounding budgets amid an upcoming contentious election. Truly none of us could have imagined back in the winter quarter of 2019 that our world would be in this place at this moment.

In my life when faced with such daunting challenges, I find my comfort and hope in looking back at history. While writing this, I looked for other moments when the University of Washington faced tremendous adversity and that took me on a journey into one of the darkest moments in the university's history, the Canwell Hearings.

At the end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War, the Washington state legislature passed legislation which gave “all powers necessary and convenient” to a joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities. This “Canwell” committee was concerned about faculty with “dangerous ideas” and took aim at the faculty of the University of Washington. You can read more about the Canwell Hearings here.

During that dark time in our history, with all the strength and resiliency we are known for, the university community conducted discussions about the importance of honoring and practicing shared governance. This led to an accord between the faculty and then President Schmitz in 1956 which stated:

“A university is a community of scholars contributing, each according to his own talents and interests, to the transmission and advancement of knowledge. Because of its diversity of interests a university is a complex organization, not quite like any other in its management, which requires the understanding and good faith of people dedicated to a common purpose. A university administration must seek wisely and diligently to advance the common effort, and the strength of a university is greatest when its faculty and administration join for the advancement of common objectives. Much of the faculty-administration relationship has been established through long experience, and has the weight and good sense of academic form and tradition. But the terms of this relationship are essentially those of spirit, mutual respect, and good faith, and thus must be flexible to meet changing needs. Some of the traditions of the University of Washington are given expression in the pages that follow. Yet these and other common understandings have meaning only to the extent that they reflect the integrity and faith of administration and faculty in the day by day accomplishment of their joint effort.”

With the passage of this accord, the Faculty emerged with a “constitution” in the form of the Faculty Code; the framework for shared governance that remains in effect to this day. The Code is a robust and living document which can only be changed through a majority vote of the faculty. As the accord stated, the
Code only has meaning to the extent that it reflects the integrity and faith of administration and faculty in the day-to-day work and by the joint effort of both.

In this joint effort of shared governance, I have found our current administration to be vibrant and willing partners. President Cauce, Provost Richards, and campus leadership at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma seek out faculty, student and staff voices and hear the concerns of the entire university community with an authenticity that is found in very few institutions of higher education. The Faculty Senate looks forward to continuing that productive relationship in our 82nd year.

Some of issues that need attention this year include:

**Tri-Campus:** 2020 marks the 30th year of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. In that time, they have grown organically from small experimental branch campuses to vibrant, robust universities in their own right. Together the three campuses of Bothell, Seattle, and Tacoma allow the University of Washington to provide maximum access to a world-class broad comprehensive university education. The individual focus of each campus along with an overall university commitment to Community Based Learning provides more ways in which the University meets our global mission and serves the people of the state of Washington. However, the rapid growth of Bothell and Tacoma also has ramifications in the Faculty Code. The Code has failed to keep up with new structures such as the creation of schools with Deans on Bothell and Tacoma campuses as well as issues of the tenure and promotion processes. As faculty at the University of Washington where we are all under the same Faculty Code, our colleagues in Bothell and Tacoma deserve a Code that reflects parity and equitable processes across the entire university.

**Communication:** With the challenges we face this year comes uncertainty. This uncertainty is made more difficult by the lack of communication channels afforded when working in an online environment. The Faculty Senate is committed to transparency in the governing process and Faculty Senate meetings are open meetings. The meetings will be conducted online this year, which will provide more opportunity for faculty to observe the senate process. Information regarding Senate meetings is posted on the Senate website and I encourage interested faculty to attend. The Faculty Senate also plans on broadening avenues of two-way communication between Senate leadership and faculty, administration and faculty, and among groups of faculty. We plan to host a variety of town hall and webinar type events that will amplify voices and broaden participation on policy issues facing the university.

**Dispute Resolution:** A team of faculty and staff have been working tirelessly to overhaul our current systems for resolving disputes involving faculty. They are in the final stages of a multi-year effort to design a modern, sustainable system incorporating mechanisms for early intervention at multiple levels. This work is coming to fruition with anticipated code revisions and vote by the faculty later in the year.

**Budget:** We all know the university’s budgetary situation is and will continue to be deeply challenged, not only as a result of likely state appropriation reductions, but also because of lost revenue from other operations across the university as well as unexpected demands on our resources to support our community and maintain our mission. Difficult decisions will have to be made, and Senate leadership, in conjunction with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, will continue to be an active voice for the interests of the faculty and the academic enterprise over the course of the year, while also thinking constructively about the future of the university.

**The 2050 Report, 2020 Edition:** Two years ago, faculty leadership produced a report which outlined goals for preparing the university for the future, the faculty of 2050. In particular, this report emphasized diversity, equity, and inclusion in hiring and promotion practices, community-engaged scholarship and emerging models of review and dissemination of scholarship, and communicating the roles of the UW as a public good. Those goals are even more important today than they were two years ago. What we failed to recognize in 2018 was how a global pandemic would highlight the cracks in our systems of operation that were there before COVID-19, but are now are gaping chasms. The pandemic has revealed inequity in caregiving responsibilities, lack of diversity, issues around promotion and tenure, job security of part-time instructors, challenges in online instruction, and burdens of service responsibilities and workload issues that do not fall equally among faculty ranks, units or campuses. There are multiple faculty councils currently working on these issues, not just for stop-gap measures, but for long-term solutions.
**Legislative:** This year our state has witnessed the highest unemployment rates since the Great Depression. Our legislature will face incredible demands to help those in economic need and support critical public health infrastructure, all in a climate of diminished revenue and statutory requirements to balance the budget. The university has been told to expect budget cuts, but we don’t yet know how deep. We will be doing our best to convey to our colleagues in Olympia what is at stake--how this institution improves, enlightens, and transforms lives. We are going to need all the help we can get.

When we get to the other side of the pandemic, we will be forever changed as will the University of Washington. It is very easy to get caught up in whatever crisis that is swirling around us and lose sight of our future. The Faculty Senate leadership team hopes to have the flexibility to address current pressing needs as they arise and also to think about what kind of a University we want to be when we get to that other side.

Faculty governance works best when everyone participates so that all voices are heard and represented. I encourage you to be actively involved in faculty governance this year and in the future. The Faculty Senate website has information about meetings and deliberations of the Faculty Senate, Senate Executive Committee, the eleven faculty councils, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions.

Robin L. Angotti  
Chair, Faculty Senate  
Professor, Engineering & Mathematics, UW Bothell
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. All faculty members of Faculty Councils have been appointed. Welcome to all returning and new members! Council membership, along with meeting minutes and schedules, can be found on our website at https://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/.

2. Work continues on crafting a new dispute-resolution process. Pre-drafting discussions, which took place under the auspices of the steering and values and principles subcommittees of the dispute-resolution task force, are complete and included a wide-range of stakeholders. The code-writing process has been ongoing in the drafting subcommittee over the summer and feedback has been sought from a small set of outside reviewers. Code will be distributed in installments to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs beginning in the Autumn Quarter of 2020 with an anticipated faculty vote on the completed work during the spring quarter of 2021.

3. SEC, Senate, and Council meetings will be continue to be on-line per State and University policy. Senate leadership and office staff largely will be working remotely, but can be reached at their usual numbers and by email.

4. We are looking for a new member for the University Faculty Lecture Award Selection Committee. Interested faculty should contact secfac@uw.edu.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Joseph Janes, Associate Professor, Information School

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budget, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions.

In any typical year, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting would engage on a range of topics: the annual University-wide budget review and preparation process, faculty compensation including merit increases and unit adjustments, tuition and fee rates and the ABB model, requests for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of academic programs (the RCEP process), monitoring of deficits in academic and administrative units, consultation on key units, projects and initiatives, and more.

Many of these continue to be relevant in the current environment, to varying degrees, and SCPB will continue its role in monitoring and advising on them. We now face additional, unexpected, unprecedented and unpredictable issues and challenges across the institution, including in major and substantial units, which could have profound and enduring impacts on the university as a whole. The membership of SCPB has broad and considerable experience to bring to bear on these matters.

Very difficult conversations and decisions are to come. At moments like this, however, it is also worth taking a broader view, to the extent possible, and considering deeper questions, which are closely linked to budgetary matters as well as the planning side of our charge: What institutional and academic priorities and values will guide our deliberations and decisions in the months and years to come? What strategies will we employ to move us forward? How can we prepare for the multiple landscapes that lie ahead? And, ultimately, what kind of university do we want to be?
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative  
Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

This report includes commentary on the state budget outlook and results from the Faculty Public Engagement Survey.

**September Budget Updates**

Local media extensively covered the latest projections from Olympia, which suggest an outlook that can be summarized as “improving, but still not great.” Between February and June, revenue projections for the state’s “near general fund” dropped 8.4%. Revisions in September brought the projection to a point just 4.4% lower than the February baseline. So for every dollar the state expected to lose as of June, we’re now expecting to lose only 50 cents. The state also projects a revenue shortfall in the 2021-2023 biennium, with the September 2020 projection 3.6% lower than the February estimate.

The remaining revenue shortfall is still too large to be plugged with available “rainy day” funds and the state will almost certainly realize greater-than-forecast expenditures on safety net programs given the economic impact of the pandemic.

Why are things not quite so gloomy as we thought three months ago? To a significant extent, we can thank Federal intervention. The $600/week pandemic unemployment assistance, on top of assistance to employers and to low-to-moderate income households kept consumers spending even if they couldn’t find work. This meshed well with Washington’s tax regime, which collects revenue from consumption (sales tax) rather than employment (income tax). As we’ll see, many on the faculty hope that the state will take up the question of income taxation in the next session, however it should be noted that a side effect of maintaining a relatively regressive tax structure is that it’s more immune to recession – spending declines less than income during a recession, as consumers draw down their savings and take on debt.

The picture could get gloomier again. Pandemic unemployment assistance is over and it’s not clear there will be another infusion of Federal assistance. The pandemic is not over yet. Unemployment will likely persist at elevated levels for many more months, and without Federal assistance consumers will increasingly face difficult choices to cut back their spending. There may be more light filtering down through the trees but we are far from out of the woods yet.

**Faculty suggestions for 2021 legislative priorities**

On September 18th a survey went out to Senators with a request to forward to their constituents. This catalyst survey has no closing date so please feel free to review, respond, or forward using this link.

This survey seeks suggestions for legislative priorities, with an opportunity for open-ended response. As of this writing, seventy-six faculty members have responded. These responses can be divided into three categories:

1. Items of general interest to the faculty.
2. Items of more specialized interest.
3. Items that are more appropriate for on-campus consideration.

The following items, suggested by one or more respondents, are conceivably of interest to a broad array of faculty across campuses, schools, and departments. They would likely be of interest to our colleagues at peer institutions as well.

- **Maintain and enhance support for public higher education.** Many respondents noted the long-term downward trend in state support for the University, which has led to an increased reliance on tuition and other sources of revenue. The faculty can help illuminate the ways in which the University of Washington serves and enlightens every corner of the state.

- **Address impediments in state law that impair efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty.** In November 2019 Washington state voters repealed Initiative 1000, effectively forbidding the
University from implementing affirmative action policies. UW faculty can help make the case that public interests are served by ensuring our scholarly community represents the widest possible array of individual backgrounds and perspectives.

- **Promote progressive taxation.** Faculty expressed an interest in advocating for expanded state support for higher education without detrimental impacts on K-12 education or other state spending priorities. The only means of accomplishing this is by identifying new streams of state revenue. Independent arbiters have flagged Washington’s system of state and local taxation as the nation’s most regressive.

- **Suspend Washington’s balanced budget statute.** Like most states, Washington is required to operate with balanced budgets. Unlike many states, our requirement is not written into the state constitution. Suspending the balanced budget law would allow extra breathing room in the near term. Constitutional provisions would restrict the amount of debt the state could issue.

- **Exempt public universities from sales and use taxation.** Washington is one of only seven states that require public universities to pay sales tax on purchases of goods and services. This places faculty at a disadvantage relative to colleagues in most states when it comes to purchasing research equipment, particularly when competing for grants with fixed budget caps. With annual goods and services purchases on the order of $200M and sales tax rates on the order of 10%, the University is required to rebate an eight-figure sum to state and local government each year.

- **Standardize/streamline contracting between UW and state agencies.** Many faculty conduct projects in collaboration with state agencies, in some cases using state-owned administrative datasets. The contracting process can be cumbersome and expensive, with significant duplication of effort when individual faculty apply for access to the same resources. Agency personnel will point to state regulations that prevent the establishment of master data sharing agreements or contracts.

- **Address aspects of open public meetings law that impair the operation of committees and departments.** The requirement to hold open public meetings impaired the normal conduct of faculty business in Spring quarter, including the Faculty Senate. Revisions to state law could promote the faculty’s ability to administer academic programs and departments without unduly compromising the public’s right to know and understand the institutions they support.

- **Amend public records law to clarify and expand protections for research subjects, and to restrict politically-motivated efforts to impede research.** When a research subject contacts a UW investigator, they should be fully assured that their correspondence, and their identity as a participant in a research study, is not subject to public disclosure. Federal regulations offer some protection, but revisions to state law could address certain loopholes. Public records requests have in the past been used as a weapon of harassment against faculty conducting research on politically controversial topics; revisions to state law could impose a higher bar for requestors seeking information on faculty research.

- **Seek financial support for specific activities, functions, or initiatives.** Examples:
  - Uncompensated care provided by UW Medicine/School of Dentistry.
  - UW libraries
  - Interdisciplinary initiatives (Urban@UW, PopHealth, Earthlab).

The following items, typically offered by a single faculty member, are likely of interest too narrow to warrant adding to the official set of Senate legislative priorities. The office of the Faculty Legislative Representative could play a role in facilitating conversation between individual faculty members and appropriate legislative staff.

- Reconsider certification testing requirements for graduates of Masters in Teaching programs.
- Promote collection and dissemination of health and health disparity data with fine geographic detail.
- Accelerate the transition to clean energy.
- Fund the statewide cardiac and stroke care system.
- Address water quality.
- Support reintroduction of Senate bill 6128 to expand postpartum medical insurance for new mothers.
- Support enhancement of Medicaid reimbursements to providers.
- Support women’s access to contraception and abortion care.
Expand Medicaid coverage of oral medicine procedures.

Finally, although this survey was intended to collect suggested priorities for action in the state legislature, several respondents brought up issues more appropriate for consideration by the Senate and University leadership.

- Voting rights for clinical faculty
- Clarify procedures and standards for merit review, hiring, and promotion
- Address inequities in compensation, job security, and workload expectations between teaching-track and tenure-track faculty; examine salaries of the highest-paid university employees.
- Extend time limits on the filing of grievances.
- Expand support for research translation.
- Examine undergraduate curriculum requirements, particularly waivers awarded to students for work undertaken in high school. These waivers disproportionately impact certain departments and programs.
2020-21 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Aaron Katz, School of Public Health, as an emeritus member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Ronald Kwon, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Andrea Otanez, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Bobby Wilson, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

- Kathleen Peterson, School of Public Health, as an emeritus member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021

Faculty Council on University Libraries

- Michael Kucher, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.

Student Reviewing Officers (extend terms)

- Christoph Giebel, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Max Louzon, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Scott Hauck, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2023.
- Nancy Kool, UW Bothell, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2023.
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24.

To: The Senate Executive Committee
From: The Faculty Council on Women in Academia
Re: Proposed Class A Legislation Revising Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code: Improving Transparency in the Promotion and Tenure Process
Date: February 7, 2020

On February 7, 2020, FCWA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate. On September 28, 2020, the proposed legislation was reaffirmed by the 2020-2021 membership of FCWA.

Background and Rationale

Hiring

The promotion and tenure process truly starts before a faculty member is even hired. The faculty recruitment process is a lengthy and expensive dialog intended to ensure a good fit between the University and the faculty member. As tenure-track positions decline in number, the competition for the highest quality candidates becomes more fierce. Articles about what to expect in the tenure process make the assumption that tenure guidelines are available, so not having them puts the University of Washington at a disadvantage in the hiring process, as well as when our qualified candidates are preparing for their tenure dossier.

The AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as updated and endorsed in 1970, identifies that instructors in their “probationary period” be offered the precise terms and conditions of their appointment, in writing, prior to the appointment. While this can be interpreted to mean salary and benefits, the Statement also indicates that it is a living code, subject to reinterpretation with changing times. The Statement lists no other reason for termination prior to the end of probationary period other than incompetence, moral turpitude, and financial exigency, so it would therefore seem to imply that the terms of passing out of the probationary period would have been included in the “terms and conditions” of appointment. This can, in modern terms, be interpreted in part as the tenure and promotion guidelines.

Peer Institutions

While each individual department or school may use a different set of peer institutions for their own comparison or accreditation purposes, the Office of Planning and Budget uses the U.S. News Top-25 Public Research Institutions for its main comparison group. The FCWA also used this group, therefore, to determine the current state of practice for publicly accessible tenure and promotion guidelines. A list of these schools, and their practices regarding the publication of P&T policies and guidelines can be found in Appendix A. We would like to highlight a few of the specifics from our research here. One peer institution, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, expressly identifies the lack of articulation of P&T standards for junior faculty as negatively affecting their beliefs about the transparency regarding the university leadership, and its ability to mentor future leaders. A task force commissioned by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill recognized the need for tenure criteria to be “up-to-date, clear, and applied fairly”, in order to promote transparency in the criteria and their application, which will in turn ensure better quality decision making in the tenure granting process. The University of Maryland, in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures document, specifically require their institutions to have written procedures for tenure and promotion that state criteria, procedures, and methods for appeals. In total, 15/21 schools had posted guidelines. Of those 6 that did not, 4 were in one University System (UC) and likely subject to similar internal policies. Clarity, specificity, and transparency remain the overarching themes.

---

4. https://faa.illinois.edu/strategy-overview-2014%E2%80%9317
5. https://provost.unc.edu/taskforce-future-promotion-tenure-policies-practices/
6. https://president.umd.edu/administration/policies/section-ii-faculty/ii-100a
Our University

A review of the Schools at the University of Washington (counting the University of Washington Bothell and University of Washington Tacoma as one unit each, per the current state of University governance), shows that of the 19 Schools and Colleges, 9 have no published guidelines, 1 is available through an Intranet, 4 are accessible through a site-based Internet search, and 3 are easily findable from the main page of the school. This does not fit with the themes of clarity, specificity, and transparency. Further details are available in Appendix B.

What We Propose to Do

This is a proposal to add the word “published” to the following section of the Faculty Code:
Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the published guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above), the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011;
S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013; S-A 142, June 22, 2018: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020
What Will Change?

This change will not affect the content or process of these guidelines. Those will still be determined by the units, according to their own needs. This requirement will simply require those guidelines to be made publicly accessible.

Why Are We Proposing This?

FCWA has identified a number of compelling reasons why we believe this change is essential at this time.

- **Equity:** Increasing the transparency of promotion and tenure guidelines will benefit women-identifying faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who have disabilities relating to information processing. Each of these groups are harmed when guidelines are inconsistently applied or unknown.

- **Recruitment and Retention:** Many of our peer institutions have published guidelines, so having a lack of the same leaves us at a competitive disadvantage in the hiring market.
## Appendix A
### Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Posted Guidelines</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University - Main Campus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Academic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://artsandarchitecture.psu.edu/facstaff/promten">https://artsandarchitecture.psu.edu/facstaff/promten</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/provosts-communications/communication-9-promotion-and-tenure/promotion-tenure-frequently-asked-questions/">https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/provosts-communications/communication-9-promotion-and-tenure/promotion-tenure-frequently-asked-questions/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td><a href="https://regents.umich.edu/governance/bylaws/chapter-v-the-faculties-and-academic-staff/">https://regents.umich.edu/governance/bylaws/chapter-v-the-faculties-and-academic-staff/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University - New Brunswick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://policies.rutgers.edu/view-policies/human-resources-hr-%E2%80%93-section-60">https://policies.rutgers.edu/view-policies/human-resources-hr-%E2%80%93-section-60</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Davis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - San Diego</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Irvine</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.3.7-promotion-and-tenure-evaluation">http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.3.7-promotion-and-tenure-evaluation</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Distribution</td>
<td>Guidelines Posted</td>
<td>Guidelines Easily Accessible</td>
<td>Guidelines Clearcut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster School of Business</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Science</td>
<td>Yes <a href="https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dept-guidelines">https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dept-guidelines</a></td>
<td>Searchable, found under the administrative gateway. No obvious link.</td>
<td>Yes, both process and criteria are included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Under “My CoE”, two clicks.</td>
<td>Yes, on both process and criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Under Intranet, Policies A-Z</td>
<td>Only on Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Computer Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td>Process, but from 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Sort of</td>
<td>Under My Coe</td>
<td>Guidelines for 3rd Year review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson School of International Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans School of Public Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>Sort of</td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td>Policies and some broad criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Medicine</td>
<td>Yes for some schools</td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td>Very specific when available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>Yes, sort of</td>
<td>Searchable.</td>
<td>Policy only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td><a href="https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure#Resources%20and%20Policies">https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure#Resources%20and%20Policies</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you know to look under the “Faculty Assembly” page, they can be found in 3 clicks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For some units, they are similar to the Ohio State ones. For other units, they are more vague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

On March 10, 2020, FCFA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate, but it was not submitted because of the governor’s COVID-19 restrictions. On September 25, 2020, the proposed legislation was reaffirmed by the 2020-2021 membership of FCFA.

Background and Rationale

Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code describes the process for promotion of faculty members. The crux of the process is an optional subcommittee report, followed by a vote by the eligible voting faculty on whether to recommend promotion.

Before 2018, it was possible for a promotion subcommittee to include voting members of the faculty from outside the candidate’s own department or college, provided they were superior in academic rank and title to the person up for promotion. A change was made to the code in 2018 to adjust the voting hierarchy so that assistant professors would no longer vote on the promotion of senior lecturers to principal lecturers; but the wording of that code change inadvertently stipulated that members of a promotion subcommittee had to be members of the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school). This greatly reduced the number of faculty members available to serve on promotion subcommittees and caused hardships for some departments and colleges.

When FCFA was contemplating a way to fix this problem, we discovered a second problem that did not have to do with the 2018 change: sometimes, in very small departments, the number of faculty members of sufficient rank to vote on a particular promotion case can be extremely small, with only two, one, or even no faculty members eligible to vote. This can be particularly acute for promotion of a tenured faculty member from Associate Professor to Professor, in which case only tenured or WOT full professors can vote. Conducting a “departmental vote” (or college vote in an undepartmentalized college) with so few voting members can create a perception of unfairness and a lack of confidentiality on the part of those voting.

What We Propose to Do

To solve the first problem, we propose to explicitly allow promotion subcommittees to include members from outside the candidate’s department or college who have appropriate expertise, provided they are qualified by rank and title to vote on such a promotion case. Then to solve the second problem, we propose to require such a subcommittee (with three or more members) in cases where there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the candidate’s unit, and then to use the report of that subcommittee in lieu of a departmental vote. (Note that all subcommittee reports and departmental promotion votes are advisory to the chair and, ultimately, to the dean.)

What Will Change?

The biggest change will be that in cases where there are fewer than three voting faculty members in a unit who are eligible by rank and title to vote on a particular promotion case, there will no longer be an official departmental vote (or college vote in the undepartmentalized colleges) on the case. Instead, a subcommittee of at least three will be formed, which may include faculty members from outside the candidate’s department, college, school, or campus, and that committee’s report will serve in lieu of the departmental (or undepartmentalized college) vote. If there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s unit, they must be offered the opportunity to serve on the committee.

A more minor change is that in units that do have at least three eligible voting faculty members, we will revert to the situation before 2018: if a subcommittee does issue an initial report, it may contain members from outside the candidate’s unit.
The Proposed Class A Legislation:

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.

Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The following paragraph defines “eligibility” to serve on a promotion subcommittee, to participate in departmental or college deliberations, and to vote on the case. (Further limitations are described below.) Sections 21-32 C and D referred to here stipulate that research faculty don’t vote on promotion of teaching faculty or vice versa, and neither research nor teaching faculty vote on promotion or tenure of tenure-track and WOT faculty.

Eligibility to deliberate and vote on a recommendation of promotion is limited to voting members of the faculty who are superior in academic rank and title to the person under consideration. Subject to the limitations described in Section 21-32, Subsections C and D.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Artists in residence shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate’s college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

An initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion may be produced by a subcommittee. Such a subcommittee must consist of at least three eligible voting faculty members (where eligibility is defined in Subsection A above), and may include faculty drawn from other departments, schools, colleges, or campuses who have appropriate expertise. Members of the subcommittee shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate’s record, including external letters.

The next paragraph describes the conditions under which a subcommittee must be formed. In that case, if there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s unit, they must be offered the opportunity to serve on the committee, because the committee’s report will be used in lieu of a departmental vote.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the department (or undepartmentalized college or school), a subcommittee shall be formed as described above, and it shall include any
eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are available to serve.

For a department (or undepartmentalized college or school) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above), the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. The written summary shall identify the members of the subcommittee. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the eligible voting faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

The next two paragraphs describe the procedure to be followed in case there are at least three eligible voting faculty members in the unit. The basic procedure is discussion of the case (including all subcommittee members if they so choose), followed by a vote (where only eligible voting members may be present), followed by a chair's report to the dean.

If there are three or more eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department (or undepartmentalized college or school), those eligible voting faculty members shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record, and following the discussion they shall vote whether to recommend promotion. If an initial report was produced by a subcommittee, all members of the subcommittee may choose to participate in the discussion, but only eligible voting faculty in the candidate's department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may be present for the vote. The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

And now the simpler procedure in the case that there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the unit.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department (or undepartmentalized college or school), the recommendation of the subcommittee shall be used in lieu of a vote by the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

For departmentalized colleges, this final paragraph enumerates the situations in which the case must go forward to the dean: if the departmental recommendation is favorable, or it's mandatory decision time, or the candidate writes a response to the departmental decision.

If the candidate is a member of a departmentalized college or school, then in case the departmental recommendation (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department) is a departmental one, and is favorable or the promotion decision is mandatory or the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department), the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.
Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013; S-A 142, June 22, 2018: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 101, Section 1 (Preliminary Statements and Definitions, Program-Specific Students)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, with the support of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101 (Admissions) based on the following findings:

- Lack of access to state-funded courses at the UW forces students admitted to fee-based programs to seek general education and elective course options at other institutions, inside and outside Washington State.

- Undergraduate online students completing their degrees in fee-based programs have access to only a small number of online courses they need to complete their degree.

- The university is losing considerable tuition revenue (SCH) by denying students access to these UW courses.

- The university is also diminishing the "Husky experience" for these students who are taking their electives at another institution.

- Home units can maintain control of their enrollment requirements and procedures for their courses, so the impact of expanded access should be de minimis. For example, a home unit could limit the total number of fee-based students that could enroll in a course, or limit the period in which fee-based students could enroll.

Chapter 101
Admission

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

1.E.2 Program-Specific Student

A program-specific undergraduate student is one who has been competitively admitted to a specific degree program and must choose from a limited number of courses specifically identified in his or her program. Admission is restricted to this program and does not qualify the student for admission to other degree programs of the University of Washington. To be admitted to other degree programs, the students must separately apply. The student shall be informed by the program of any additional restrictions related to his or her enrollment.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020
Class B Legislation: FCT&L

• **PROBLEM**: Currently, undergraduate students in fee-based programs have either very limited or no access to State courses, and so to complete their degrees they are forced to take classes OUTSIDE the UW (many times outside Washington State). This drives tuition dollars and SCH away from the UW, and significantly diminishes the “Husky experience” for these students.

• **HISTORY**: Originally, restrictions were placed on these state courses because there was an (anticipated/unproven) fear that fee-based undergraduate student registrations would overwhelm these state courses- this has proven over time NOT to be the case, the impact of fee-based undergraduate students on state courses has been de minimus.

• **SOLUTION**: Recognize the longitudinal data on impact, remove restrictions on fee-based students to take state courses, keep tuition at UW and increase SCH, improve the academic (“Husky”) experience of these students.
Chapter 101

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

1.E.2 Program-Specific Student

A program-specific undergraduate student is one who has been competitively admitted to a specific degree program and must choose from a limited number of courses specifically identified in his or her program. Admission is restricted to this program and does not qualify the student for admission to other degree programs of the University of Washington. To be admitted to other degree programs, the students must separately apply. The student shall be informed by the program of any additional restrictions related to his or her enrollment.


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020
Transfer Credits after Matriculation
In the Integrated Social Sciences (ISS) Program

Who is taking classes outside the UW after matriculation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of unique courses</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Transfer credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISS Alum</td>
<td>WA State CC</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>997.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>928.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-yet-alum</td>
<td>WA State CC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>171.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of all students listed in the UW Student Data Base (SDB) with their major as “Integrated Social Sciences” (ISS) is 807. This includes active students, students who have stepped out for a quarter or two, students who have withdrawn and do not intend to return, and alum. Of these 807 students, 381 are alumni of ISS. Therefore, the percentages of ISS students who have taken classes outside the UW and transferred credits into UW after matriculation into the major are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>percent of all ISS students</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent of ISS alum</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent of not-yet-ISS alum</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is this costing ISS and the UW?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Transfer credits</th>
<th>Estimated lost revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISS Alum</td>
<td>WA State CC</td>
<td>997.0</td>
<td>278,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>928.5</td>
<td>259,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-yet-alum</td>
<td>WA State CC</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>47,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>28,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td><strong>613,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>